

REMARKS

Claims 3 and 7-19 were pending in the present application prior to amendment herein. Claims 7, 13, and 17-19 have been canceled, and new claims 20 and 21 have been added. Claims 3, 8-12, 14-16, 20, and 21 are therefore now pending in the present application.

Claim 3 has been amended in order to remove the indefinite language noted on page 2 of the Office Action and to incorporate the limitation of claim 7, and claims 3, 9, 10, and 12 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis. Claim 15 has also been amended to clarify this claim. New claims 20 and 21, which depend from claims 3 and 12 respectively, find support in the specification on page 1 in paragraph [0009] of the specification.

No new matter has been added to this application by the amendments made herein, with support being found in the specification, claims and figures as filed. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment and consideration of the present application as amended herein.

Objection to the Claims

Claims 12 and 13 were objected to under 37 CFR §1.75 as being substantial duplicates of one another. The Applicant has canceled independent claim 13 and claims 17-19 that depended therefrom. In view of this, the Applicant respectfully requests that the foregoing objection to the claims be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

Claims 3 and 7-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. The phrase “such as” in claim 3 was found to render this claim indefinite, and so has therefore been deleted for clarity. The Applicant has further amended claims 3, 9, 10, and 12 in order to address a lack of antecedent basis for the phrase “the queried criteria” in these claims.

Claims 8, 11 and 14-16 do not include the phrase “the queried criteria,” and claims 13 and 17-19 have been canceled, making this ground of rejection moot with respect to these claims. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 and 7-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herrero (US 20020078007) in view of Borland, R. (1997). The Herrero reference is characterized in paragraph 14 of the Office Action as disclosing the inputting of records comprising a unique task number (on page 6 in paragraphs [0067] and [0068]). The cited portions of the Herrero reference, however, do not disclose records with a “unique task number,” but instead describe records having a “task number” and “a unique e-mail address.” Because of this, if a task is assigned to more than one individual, the Herrero system generates multiple entries having the same task number, but different (unique) email addresses:

Each entry on the task assignment list includes a task number and a contact number (or ID). For example if the first task (number 1) is assigned to one contact, then the task assignment list will include only one entry for that task. **If as shown, the second task is assigned to two users, then the task assignment list will include two entries for that task. Each entry will identify one of the two contacts.**

(Paragraph [0068], lines 9-6, emphasis added)

By contrast, in the presently claimed method and computer product, a unique task number is assigned to each record of a database, and such task numbers are not reused if the record associated with that task number is deleted. The Applicant’s use of unique task numbers thereby avoids key violations in the database (see page 1, paragraph [008] of the present application). Unlike the system of Herrero, the Applicant’s invention

allows for multiple records which include the same e-mail address, because each record of the database comprises a unique task identifier.

In view of this, the Herrero reference does not teach or suggest the use of database records comprising a unique task number to organize and track information. The Borland reference does not supply this deficiency. In view of this, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is patentable over the Herrero and Borland references, and respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 3 and 7-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. If any issues remain which can be resolved by communicating with the Applicants' representative by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON & MAK PC

Date: April 11, 2007

By: /michael fedrick/
Michael Fedrick
Reg. No. 36,799

225 South Lake Avenue, 9th Flr.
Pasadena, California 91101
(626) 796-4000
Customer No. 23676